



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,744	01/30/2004	Anna Helgadottir	30847/2051-004	6429
4743 7590 04/30/2008 MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
GEMBEHL, SHIRLEY V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/769,744

Applicant(s)

HELGADOTTIR ET AL.

Examiner

SHIRLEY V. GEMBEH

Art Unit

1614

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SHIRLEY V. GEMBEH.(3) Sharon Sintich.(2) David Gass.(4) Ardin Marschel.

Date of Interview: 4/22/08.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rossoni et al, Gompertz et al Folco et al and Byrum et al of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants disagreed with the position of combining the prior art in the obviousness rejection, also that the model used (rabbit) is not the same model they used. Examiner agreed to look at the models again however, finds the rejection was properly done from the teachings of the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Shirley V. Gembah/ 4/23/08

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required